



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,443	05/07/2007	Shoji Fukumoto	20039.0006USWO	7172
52835	7590	12/30/2009	EXAMINER	
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.			SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
P.O. BOX 2902			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			1625	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,443	FUKUMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taofiq A. Solola	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-18 and 28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/5/06</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Claims 19-27 are non-elected inventions.

Response to Restriction

The election of group I, claims 1-18 and 28, in the Paper filed 11/6/09 is hereby acknowledged. There is no indication if the election is made with or without traverse. Therefore, it is deemed made without traverse.

The restriction is therefore deemed proper and made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-18, 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims lack adequate support in the specification. The terms "hydrocarbon" for example see claim 1, line 9, and "prodrug" (claim 17) are not defined in the specification so as to ascertain the structures of compounds that are included and/or excluded by the terms. Hydrocarbon embraces the entire textbook of organic chemistry. A claim must stand alone to define the invention, and incorporation into the claims by reference to the specification or an external source is not permitted. Ex parte Fressola, 27 USPQ 2d 1608, BdPatApp & Inter. (1993). Applicant must show possession of the invention by describing it with all the claimed limitations. *Lookwood v. American Airlines Inc.* 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966

(Fed Cir. 1997). In patent examination, it is essential for claims to be precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989). By deleting the terms in every occurrence the rejection would be overcome.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18, 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the reasons set forth above under 35 USC 112, first paragraph it is not possible to determine the metes and bounds of the claims. See the Examiner's suggestions above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kinji et al., JP 05-132484, and Cecchi et al., Farmaco, Edizione Scientitifica, (1995), Vol. 40, pp. 509-516, individually.

Kinji et al., disclose compounds 1-3, Table 1, page 40; and Cecchi et al., disclose compounds IIIa-c, Table 1, page 512. The compounds are deemed prodrugs of the instant compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4, 6-13, 15-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinji et al., JP 05-132484.

Claims 1-4, 6-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cecchi et al., Farmaco, Edizione Scientitifica, (1995), Vol. 40, pp. 509-516, individually.

Applicant claims compounds of formula I and composition thereof. In the formula, R1 is optionally substituted aryl (phenyl), the substituent is optionally substituted alkyl; R2 is H or amine group; R5 is H, halogen or hydrocarbon; R3-R4 and R6 are each H or hydrocarbon.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

Kinji et al., disclose compound 4, Table 1, page 40, wherein R1 is phenyl (aryl); R2 is amine group; R5 is Cl (halogen); R3-R4, R6 are each H.

Cecchi et al., disclose compounds IIId-e, Table 1, page 512; wherein R1 is substituted aryl (substituent is methyl (alkyl) ; R2 is methyl (alkyl); R3-R6 are each H.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP 2141.02)

The difference between the instant invention and that of Kinji et al., is that applicant replaces methyl (alkyl) with H on the quinoline ring N. That is applicant claims 2° amine instead of 3° amine by Kinji et al.

The difference between the instant invention and that of Cecchi et al., is that applicant replaces methyl (alkyl) with H at position R2.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP 2142.2413)

However, H and alkyl are art recognized equivalents. *In re Lincoln*, 126 USPQ 477, 53 USPQ 40 (CCPA, 1942); *In re Druey*, 319 F.2d 237, 138 USPQ 39 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Lohr*,

317 F.2d 388, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Hoehsema*, 399 F.2d 269, 158 USPQ 598 (CCPA, 1968); *In re Wood*, 582 F.2d 638, 199 USPQ 137 (CCPA, 1978); *In re Hoke*, 560 F.2d 436, 195 USPQ 148 (CCPA, 1977); *Ex parte Fauque*, 121 USPQ 425 (POBA, 1954); *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474, (POBA, 1960).

Also, secondary and tertiary amines are obvious variants. *Ex parte Bluestone*, 135 USPQ 199 (1961). Therefore, the instant invention is *prima facie* obvious from the teachings of the prior arts. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to claim the instant compounds at the time the invention was made. The motivation is from the general knowledge in the art that H and alkyl are equivalents, and secondary and tertiary amines are obvious variants.

Reference

JP 2002-514228 A and JP 2002-506537 A, cited in ISR of PCT/JP05/003086, were not forwarded to this office by WIPO and are therefore not of record. Applicant must file the documents in responding to this Office action.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Application/Control Number: 10/589,443
Art Unit: 1625

Page 6

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

December 17, 2009